

Niroshia

17 Oct 94

~~Was~~ Was being Niroshia seen by
an leader as the only ~~alternative~~
way to achieve Japanese surrender
without invading Japan — i.e. as the
only alternative to an invasion?

No. Several other ways —
that did not involve killing
of civilians — were recommended
by high US officials. They were seen as
being at least as likely to achieve
J. surrender as any hoped for the
Bomb, or more so, and as being able
to do so sooner than the Bomb
could be ready. But they were
rejected. DST J. (+ Byrnes +
Stimson) preferred to use the Bomb
than to try these other approaches first.

In retrospect, the other approaches probably (?) would have worked.

In fact, the Hiroshima Bomb did not produce an immediate Japanese ^{It did not} surrender. ~~Not~~ ^{was} until the other two approaches — SU entry, and some assurance to the Emperor — had both occurred, after Hiroshima.

(I.e. it is not clear — I would say, unlikely — that the Bomb by itself was an attraction to these approaches, a way of ending the war [without reassurance to the Emperor].

Basically, the same people who claim that Japanese will never sacrifice military casualties — so that nothing less than the Bomb would produce surrender (i.e. so that of mil. cost could work)

under-ate it will give to 3
accept certain casualties — to pursue
to Expend — as shown by Tulgo and
other cities (not, Oklahoma!).

(see Spilman, Front Report).

— So what? There is not. Guilt,
Crime, Apology, Compensation.

2) The actual effective matters
are wrongly stated, (over-stated
+ "idealized" ("saving lives").
(see. foreword!)

2) Our own leaders' inhibitions
against using over (unapproved)
are greatly over-stated; which is
wrongly misleading about the future
behavior of our own and others' leaders.

3) An historical use of the Bank — the only
one — is now (by US) as unquestionably justified,
so that the principle is established that

(not my possession,
think) but
use of

a) use can be justified : the Bomb
is not (at all!) unequivocally evil,
forbidden; it may (well - it has been) both
~~the~~ justified +

b) Our leaders can be trusted to make
this decision, for us (representing us)
— is meant.

And if ~~also~~ ours can, so can
others (except ~~the~~ for "madmen" etc.)

[That is McN's reason for C-8]

- So problem of prolif is: keeping
Bomb away from madmen; and
detering them if necessary (which
may call for more prolif - designed
+ controlled).